

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS PO. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.upio.gov

APPLICATION NO.	PPLICATION NO. FILING DATE		FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/832,168 04/10/2001		Won Bang	004515	8789	
32588	7590	06/24/2003			
APPLIED N			EXAMINER		
	2881 SCOTT BLVD. M/S 2061 SANTA CLARA, CA 95050			ZERVIGON, RUDY	
				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
				1763	11
				DATE MAILED: 06/24/2003	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

•	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
Advisory Action	09/832,168	BANG ET AL.					
•	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Rudy Zervigon	1763					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address					
THE REPLY FILED 09 June 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.							
PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]							
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection. b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).							
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.							
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:							
(a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);							
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);							
(c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or							
(d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.NOTE:							
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):							
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).							
5. ☑ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☑ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.							
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered beca raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly						
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.							
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:							
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:							
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-11 and 17-21</u> .							
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>12-16</u> .							
B. ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.							
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)							
10. ☐ Other:							
							
		i					

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant states that "Gauthier does not teach, show, or suggest the possibility that input 176 could be an output connected to vaporizer 122...". As stated, and agreed by Applicant, it has been held that claim language that simply specifies an intended use or field of use for the invention generally will not limit the scope of a claim (Walter, 618 F.2d at 769, 205 USPQ at 409; MPEP 2106). Additionally, in apparatus claims, intended use must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim (In re Casey,152 USPQ 235 (CCPA 1967); In re Otto, 136 USPQ 458, 459 (CCPA 1963); MPEP2111.02). Further, Gauither does indeed teach, show, and suggest the three-way valve 176 can be an output to the vaporizer as is demonstrated by the recyle line that is not labelled connecting valve 174 and vaporizer 122 Regarding Applicant's position that King does not teach a controller for/between input and output valves, Applicant is directed to column 3, lines 48-64.

JEFFRIE R. LUND PRIMARY EXAMINER

Amk